

2



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/476,372	01/03/2000	BYOUNG-CHUL SOHN	Q57096	7742

7590 07/18/2003

SUGHRUE MION ZINN MACPEAK & SEAS PLLC  
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 200373202

EXAMINER

MEHRPOUR, NAGHMEH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2686

DATE MAILED: 07/18/2003

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

13

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
09/476,372

Applicant(s)  
Byoung-chul Sohl

Examiner  
Naghmeh Mehrpour

Art Unit  
2686



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Apr 3, 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 2686

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. **Claim 1**, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Brederveld et al. (US Patent Number 5,898,679).

Regarding **Claim 1**, Brederveld teaches a wireless resource allocation method in a wireless communication system including a plurality of wireless terminals and a single access point having a bridge function, the method comprising the steps of: (a) allocating a wireless resource to a corresponding wireless terminal and receiving data from said wireless terminal in said access point (col 4 lines 60-66) (b) performing a check to determine whether there is an error in said data which was received from said wireless terminal in said access point in the step (a) (col 5 lines 35-41), and © sending an error occurrence message and allocating a wireless resource for retransmission of data to said wireless terminal simultaneously when the access point detects a data error in the step (b)(col 5 lines 41-44, col 8 lines 1-6).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are

Art Unit: 2686

such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 2, 5**, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brederveld et al (US Patent Number 5,898,679) in view of Hulyalkar et al. (US Patent Number 5,787, 080).

Regarding **Claim 2**, Brederveld teaches a wireless resource allocation method wherein, in the step © said error occurrence message is sent to the corresponding wireless terminal while said wireless resource for retransmission is allocated to the corresponding wireless terminal during a down-link period (col 8 lines 1-6). Brederveld does not show that one frame comprising the down-link period and an up-link period. However Hulyalkar teaches that one frame comprising the down-link period and an up-link period (see figures 8, Col 11 lines 45-52), in case of error each Mobile by transmitting a message to request the base station for allocation of data transmission, increasing delay and decreasing an actual data transmission. Therefore, it would have been obvious to ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use above teaching of Hulyalkar to Brederveld, in order to minimize the deterioration in the transmission efficiency.

Regarding **Claim 5**, Brederveld fails to show that a wireless resource allocation method wherein during said down-link period, said access point transmits a broadcast message and various control information. However Hulyalkar teaches a wireless resource allocation method wherein during said down-link period, said access point transmits a broadcast message and various control information (see figure 8, Col 11 lines 45-52). Therefore, it would have been obvious to

Art Unit: 2686

in the art at the time the invention was made to use above teaching of Hulyalkar to Brederveld, in order to provide a communication system with better performance by reducing delay in transmission.

5. **Claim 3**, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brederveld et al (US Patent Number 5,898,679) and Hulyalkar et al. (US Patent Number 5,787, 080) in view of Johntson (US Patent Number 6,064,649).

Regarding **Claim 3**, the combination of Brederveld and Hulyalkar teaches show that a wireless resource allocation method wherein said downlink period comprises a broadcast period, and a download reservation period (Hulyalkar, col 10 lines 55-65, col 11 lines 35-45). The combination of Brederveld and Hulyalkar fails to teach a wireless resource allocation method wherein said downlink period comprises a preamble for synchronization. However Johntson teaches a wireless resource allocation method wherein said downlink period comprises a preamble for synchronization (Col 3 lines 29-39). Therefore, it would have been obvious to ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use above teaching of Johntson to the combination of Brederveld and Hulyalkar, in order to reduce transmission delay and to prevent decreasing an actual data transmission rate.

6. **Claim 4, 6**, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brederveld et al (US Patent Number 5,898,679) and Hulyalkar et al. (US Patent Number 5,787, 080) in view of Patel (US Patent Number 5,953,706).

Art Unit: 2686

Regarding **claim 4**, The combination of Brederveld and Hulyalkar fails to teach a wireless resource allocation method wherein the up-link period comprises a contention period and an upload preservation period. However Patel teach a wireless resource allocation method wherein the up-link period comprises a contention period and an upload preservation period (col 3 lines 59-65-col 4 lines 1-10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use above teaching of Patel to the combination of Brederveld and Hulyalkar, in order to provide a system with less error by reducing the stages where data is manually relayed and transcribed by various service provider.

Regarding **claim 6**, The combination of Brederveld and Hulyalkar fails a wireless resource allocation method wherein an acknowledge information or not acknowledge information the wireless terminal transmitted to the access point during the upload reservation period of a previous frame. However Patel teaches a wireless resource allocation method wherein an acknowledge information or not acknowledge information the wireless terminal transmitted to the access point during the upload reservation period of a previous frame (col 6 lines 35-51). Therefore, it would have been obvious to ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use above teaching of Patel to the combination of Brederveld and Hulyalkar, by centrally control network reduce the cost of the telephone communication, and provide more availability of services to users, because not every service provider will have a relationship with a counterpart service provider in every other city.

Art Unit: 2686

***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

**Conclusion**

8. **Any responses to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:**

(703) 872-9314, (for formal communications indented for entry)

**Or:**

(703) 308-6306, (for informal or draft communications, please label

“PROPOSED” or “DRAFT”)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, Va., sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Melody Mehrpour whose telephone number is (703) 308-7159. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday (first week of bi-week) and Monday through Friday (second week of bi-week) from 6:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

If attempt to reach the examiner are unsuccessful the examiner's supervisor, Edward F. Urban can be reached (703)305-4385.

Application/Control Number: 09/476,372

Page 7

Art Unit: 2686

NM

July 10, 2003

*Marsha D Banks-Harold*  
MARSHA D. BANKS-HAROLD  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600